

The Mind of the Church and Social Legislation

THE MOST REV. BERNARD J. MAHONEY, D.D.

Bishop of Sioux Falls

*Sermon delivered at the Third Annual Archdiocesan Catholic Action
Week, in Dubuque, October 16, 1934. Reprinted from
The Witness, October, 18, 1934.*

THE primary mission of the Catholic Church is to make known to men the claims of God on their love and service. The burden of her message is that He is "the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end," and, that He has a right to expect the first place in their thoughts and actions. The vision which she conjures up is that of another world where eternal happiness will be the portion of those who have lived up to the injunction to "render to God the things that are God's." Time and again she reminds her children that they have not here an abiding city; that their real destiny is to labor for the life to come; that this life is only a stepping stone to a never ending existence and that earthly goods are only a means for laying up treasures in heaven.

"That which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory. While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv, 17-18).

That we may the more readily acknowledge God's position in our regard, it is sufficient to remember that He is our Creator. As the Psalmist says: "He made us and not we ourselves." "His hands have moulded us and fashioned us wholly round about." All things were made by Him and without Him was made nothing that was made" (Gen. i, 3). "God created man to His own image and likeness" (Gen. i, 27).

Let us reflect a moment on the fact that a few years ago we did not exist. We were nothing. The meanest flower that blew, the vilest insect that crawled on the surface of

the earth had a grandeur denied to us. They at least throbbed with life and motion, while we were engulfed in a darkness that has no counterpart even in the abyss of gloom which the imagination associates with the grave. The world in all its activity and harmony and beauty rolled on, but about us surged the overwhelming silence of nothing.

Then, at a certain moment God reached out and breathed into us the spirit of life. We became conscious of ourselves and of our surroundings. The scales, as it were, fell from our eyes, the winding-sheet unrolled from our limbs. The string of our tongue was loosened and sounds echoed in our ears. The blood coursed through our veins and all the faculties of our soul and body awoke from their lethargy. Our wills were tuned to the music of good. Our hearts became sensitive to impressions of beauty and our minds received their capacity for truth.

Friendship and love and honor and all the other noble impulses of life became part of our inheritance. The glory of the sunset, the majesty of mountains soaring heavenward, the meadows smiling under the canvas of flower and fruit and shrub—everything that lends a charm to our sojourn here below was unfolded to our gaze. From the gloom and silence of nothing we were ushered into being. With creation came the possibility of every happiness, the beginning of everything that makes life worth while.

With life came the chance to work out the destiny that God had marked out for us. A few years here of fidelity to His law and we pass on to another existence that will never end, where He is to be "Our reward exceeding great." "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of a man what things God hath prepared for them that love Him" (Isa. lxiv, 4).

Moreover, God's interest in us did not cease when He brought us forth out of nothing. Having created us He does not leave us to ourselves. Every moment His sustaining hand supports and strengthens us. Were He to withdraw it for an instant we should lapse into nothing. It is literally true for us to say with the Apostle: "In Him we live and move and are."

So accustomed are we to life and its benefits that we may not advert to the fact that they depend entirely on God's bounty for their continuance and preservation. We are not

like a machine that once started needs no further care and attention. We are only items in a list of creatures who must be looked after and watched over from the moment they enter into the world until the hour when their course is run.

We need air and food. We need protection from the winter's cold and the summer's heat. We need friends and companions to share our joys and sorrows. We need help against the forces of nature that could so easily crush us in their might. In numberless ways we need care and attention every moment of our existence.

Now, as Holy Scripture tells us, God "reacheth from end to end mightily and ordereth all things sweetly." Thus it is that the sunshine follows the rain, the winter fades into spring, after the seed-time comes the harvest. The fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air and the beasts of the whole earth in their way minister to our wants. God's eyes are always on us. His goodness is always active on our behalf. "Who covereth the earth with clouds and prepareth rain for the earth; who maketh grass to grow on the mountains and herbs for the service of men. Who giveth to beasts their foods; and to young ravens that call upon Him" (Ps., cxlvi—8-9); "But if Thou turnest away Thy face, they shall be troubled: Thou shalt take away their breath, and they shall fail and shall return to their dust" (Ps. ciii, 28-29).

Thus God's claim on our love and service cannot be denied. To them He has an absolute and unqualified right. Because He made us, we are His property. We belong entirely to Him. He owns us. Of the faculties of our soul and body He may dispose as freely as the sculptor may dispose of the statue which he has wrought out of the shapeless mass of marble. He is our Lord and Master. We are His subjects.

Therefore, our chief concern should be to know what He wants of us. Our first obligation is to strive to measure up to His teachings and His commandments.

This has always been the position of the Catholic Church. With her God has always been the "Alpha and Omega." She has always been zealous for His law and has never departed from the way of His commandments. The secret of the opposition to her in every age centers around the charge that she has too much to say about God. In all her pronounce-

ments she has made it clear that she spoke in God's name. "Thus saith the Lord." On the rack, in times of danger and persecution she has never wavered in her loyalty to "Christ and Him Crucified." She has never yielded to popular clamor nor made concessions to fear or expediency. Because she would insist on teaching in the name of Jesus she has lost her hold on entire nations. Because she would not come down from the Cross she has been laughed at and spat upon and scorned. To those who threatened her she answered in the words of Peter and John: "If it be just in the sight of God, to hear you rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard" (Acts iv, 19-20).

From the days of the Apostles down to our own time she has rejoiced in the opprobrium heaped upon her because she would not change the burden of her message, because she would not lend her aid to keep God in the background. "And calling in the Apostles after they had scourged them they charged them that they should 'not speak at all in the name of Jesus' and they dismissed them. And they indeed went forth from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus. And every day they ceased not in the Temple and from house to house to preach Christ Jesus."

At the same time it can never be said that the Church has been wanting in sympathy and compassion for suffering humanity. Of all the institutions that ever flourished among men she alone deserves the title of the Good Samaritan. Throughout the centuries she has been following in the footsteps of the Divine Master and has been busy "healing all manner of diseases." No appeal for relief has ever been made to her in vain. There is no nation, no tribe, or people which has not felt the touch of her benign hand and the influence of her all-embracing benevolence. She has cast her shadow on poverty, sickness, vice and all manner of human misery and has left an odor of sweetness where that shadow fell. While it is true that she has sought first "The Kingdom of God and His Justice" yet she has never lessened her solicitude for those who are stamped with His image and likeness. The burden of her message has been: "God, God, God," but she has always remembered that He has said: "Amen, I say to you so long as you did it to one of these my least brethren you did it to Me" (Matt. xxv, 40). "For I was hungry and

you gave me to eat: I was thirsty and you gave me to drink: I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you clothed me; sick and you visited me: I was in prison and you came to me" (Matt. xxv, 35-46).

In our day countless numbers of her sons and daughters have renounced the joys of home and family and have given themselves to the work of relieving suffering and distress. Many of them have left their own country and their father's house to minister to strangers in a foreign land. On the field of battle, in surroundings reeking with filth and pestilence wherever humanity lies weak and wounded men and women under the direction of the Church are sacrificing themselves in the effort to bring health and comfort. In our hospitals the soft hands of devoted religious are gathering up the moisture of pain on the fevered brow, and her gentle voice is soothing the delirium that sickness conjures up. In the homes of the aged poor, women of rank and nobility are looking after the work of the shattered fragments of mind and body, and bearing patiently with the idiosyncracies of senile decay. In the houses of the Good Shepherd, virgins are folding to their bosoms the fallen flowers of a hectic springtime and infusing into them the warmth of mercy and compassion. In our asylums, homeless children are being cared for with the utmost tenderness and made to forget the misfortunes that brought them there. A Father Damien challenges the admiration of the world, by the heroism of his life among the lepers. A Father Judge wins golden opinions for what he does for the child-like miners of the frozen North.

Thus the Church has always been the greatest factor for social service which the world has ever known. The implications from her teachings have renewed the face of the earth. She has underlaid the dignity and rights of the individual, and governments have learned from her the principles that made for their stability and well-being.

Today, in a world beset on all sides by turmoil and distress, the Church stands like a beacon directing and encouraging the minds and hearts of those who are concerned with the welfare of our civilization. From his coign of vantage in the Vatican City, Pius XI is sounding the call to better things and pointing out the way to peace and security.

My dear friends, gathered together here at the call of your zealous and kindly Archbishop to concentrate for a few days

on the need of Catholic Action you deserve the encomium which St. Peter pronounced on the Christians of his day: "You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people: that you may declare His virtues, Who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light."

While here you will study the problems in our social system that are calling for solution and you will call to mind the remedies that are at hand in the teaching and philosophy of your Catholic heritage. You will remember that where there is question of moral issues and social rehabilitation, the Church, like the Divine Master, has the secret of eternal life, and that the challenge of the hour can only be met by men and women with the spirit of Christ. Once more he must rise up and command the winds and the waves.

The present national political campaign has, in particular, brought one vitally important question to the fore for our consideration. It is the question of whether the liberty we have been accustomed to enjoy under the American constitution—not merely political liberty but economic liberty as well—is being curtailed by the various agencies and bureaus set up by the Government in its attempt to regain a measure of prosperity for the country. Orators and editors, representatives of the capitalistic class as well as representatives of labor and agriculture, consume huge quantities of ink and breath in assailing one another over the threat allegedly hovering over our constitutional rights and liberties. On the other hand, hardly a word do we hear about justice, whether it be ideal justice or social justice. Now, we are well aware of the fact that there can be no real liberty if there is no justice, nor can there be justice if there is no liberty. As Catholic students of social and economic problems, we are interested in both. And with the matter of the Constitution and the liberties guaranteed us thereunder, the Catholic Church has a much closer relationship than any other living institution.

What is this topic of contention—liberty? The great Lord Acton has given its best definition: "The assurance that every man shall be protected in doing that what he believes his duty against the influence of authority and majorities, customs and opinions." And we might say further that individual liberty under modern constitutional governments in general, involves freedom of the person in going and coming,

equality before the courts, security of private property, freedom of opinion and its expression, and freedom of conscience. This agrees entirely with the Christian conception of liberty, and this latter conception of liberty we get from that charter of Christian Liberty in our Blessed Lord's words to the Jews: "Then said Jesus to those Jews who believed in Him: 'If you continue in My word, you shall be My disciples indeed. And you shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free.' They answered Him: 'We are the seed of Abraham; and we have never been slaves to any man. How sayest Thou: 'You shall be free?' Jesus answered them: 'Amen, amen, I say unto you that whosoever commiteth sin is the servant of sin. Now the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the son abideth forever. If therefore, the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed!'" The Incarnate Word promises freedom to all who accept the truth of the Gospels, and defines freedom as obedience to the laws of God.

I just said that with the matter of the Constitution and the liberties granted to us thereunder that the Catholic Church has a much closer relationship than any other living institution. The first constitutions and charters written out in the early Middle Ages were created in the encouraging atmosphere of Catholicism. The free Italian cities, the early cities of Spain coming out from under Moorish domination, the German cities along the Rhine and the Dutch and the Flemish cities, possessed charters of liberty, all inspired by Christian ideals, and in these charters were contained the fundamentals of our modern constitutions. When after the Protestant revolt of the sixteenth century, the Divine Right of Kings became the popular theory and threatened the liberties of parliaments and peoples, it was the Catholic Church which opposed this dangerous theory and upheld the liberties of the masses. Those great theological lights of the Church, Suarez, Bellarmine and Parsons, upheld the rights of democracies against the claims of the kings; these Catholic authorities were followed by John Locke, the distinguished English political writer, and he in turn was summarized and copied by Thomas Jefferson in the immortal Declaration of Independence. That great American document, the Declaration of Independence, contains the purest Catholic doctrine drawn from the foremost

Catholic scholars, and our present Constitution of the United States in as far as it drew its ideals and inspirations from the Declaration of Independence and the writings of Jefferson and Locke, embodies the age old Catholic doctrine on the liberties and rights of the peoples. That is why I say that the Catholic Church has more direct connection with the Constitution and the liberties guaranteed thereunder than any other living institution.

But just as the Catholic Church was ever the champion of liberty, she was equally the perennial and perpetual champion of social justice. Throughout the early centuries, she taught that eternal principle that to every one should be rendered his due or right. In the Middle Ages, it was Catholic theology which held the Merchant Guilds and the still more successful Craft Guilds ever firmly attached to the principles of justice. It was her Christian doctrine which forbade monopolies and cornering of the market, which enforced clean and honorable rules of competition, which denounced as a crime the taking of usury by the wealthy from those to whom they had lent gold for the necessities of life; and it was her doctrines which in the interest of social justice defended the consumers by insisting on the principle of the "justum pretium," the just price for commodities throughout Christendom. Coming down into modern times, the voice of the Church has been the only voice crying out in the wilderness of the new industrialism in stentorian tones for social justice without which there can be no true liberty. Almost a half century ago, Pope Leo announced to the world: "All agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient Workmen's Guilds were destroyed in the last century and no other organization took their place. Public institutions and the laws have repudiated the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that Working Men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious Usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church is nevertheless under a different form but with the same guilt, still practiced by avaricious and grasping men. And to this must be

added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself." And this protest against the abuse of justice is vigorously reëchoed by our present Pontiff, Pius XI, when he states: "The immense number of propertyless wage-earners on the one hand, and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few on the other, is an unanswerable argument that the earthly goods so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism are far from rightly distributed and equitably shared among the various classes of men . . . It is patent that in our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure."

"This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are also able to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood of the entire economic body, and grasping as it were in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will. This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience."

Since the Church therefore has been the pillar of defense for liberty long before constitutions were written, as well as today under constitutional forms of government, and has likewise always been the foremost advocate for social justice among men, she takes the most profound interest in the interpretations of these principles of liberty and justice in our present changing social order. Is there a clash today between the claims of liberty and the claims of social justice? There are many today, and among them some men of wisdom and experience, who profess to see in the changes attempted by the Government in the last eighteen months in the monetary and industrial and agricultural fields, a pro-

found menace to the liberties guaranteed to us by our Constitution. Although these changes are attempted in the spirit of social justice, for the purpose of bringing about a better distribution of wealth and eradicating as far as possible the evils of poverty, these opponents claim that the price we are paying is too great for the good we are receiving, since we are in danger of slipping from our status of freedom into a government of tyranny and regimentation. The immense powers, even though they are but temporary and for an emergency, given to our chief executive by our Congress for bringing about an amelioration of social and economic conditions, are regarded in some quarters with the sharpest trepidation and alarm. In all the recent enactments, from the devaluation of the gold dollar down to the codes to regulate business competition and to the curtailment of acreage to get rid of back-breaking agricultural surpluses they pretend to see an interference with the liberties granted to individuals under our Constitution. But a few weeks ago in an address at the Century of Progress in Chicago, former Senator James A. Reed of Missouri, while admitting the minimum wage laws set up by the Government under NRA codes were to some degree beneficial, professed to see even in that a great danger to freedom; for, he asked, if a government can set up minimum wage laws, cannot that government then by the same token some day set up maximum wage laws, prohibiting the working class from securing the high wages to which it believes itself entitled? The obvious answer, that the Government, in order to protect the public from unjust exploitation whether by monopolies of labor or of commodities, has in the past and may again in the future put a limit on wages and prices in the interest of justice, never struck the senatorial brain. Such arguments merely demonstrate the delicious asininity which lies behind some of the opposition to our progressive social legislation today. Most of the arguments for and against the supposed abridgements of constitutional liberties rest upon widely divergent interpretations of the Constitution by different individuals and authorities. There is nothing clear cut or definite about any of it, and we can safely await the final interpretations by the agency which has been set up for that purpose, the Supreme Court of the United States.

But until that time, wherever there seem today to be a

clash between merely abstract liberties and concrete cases of social justice, our only choice must be to follow justice. Why argue about abstract and, as yet, theoretical constitutional liberties, when we are standing face to face with millions of men who want jobs and bread? The constant accusation of government regimentation of industry and government interference with private business is a coldly uninteresting item of constitutionality to men who cannot be sure of their breakfast tomorrow morning and are merely looking for justice. Under the plea of liberty, many would go back to the old, unregulated *laissez faire* system of individualism. But knowing that this has subverted justice, the Catholic Church has placed itself in opposition to it, and has demanded that the State interfere, if one may use that term, in behalf of the weaker but numerically larger elements of society. The Popes have proclaimed the doctrine that "the civil power is more than the mere guardian of law and order, and that it must strive with all zeal to make sure that the laws and institutions should be such as of themselves to realize public well-being and private property. "It is true indeed," continue the Pontiffs, "that a just freedom of action should be left to individual citizens and families; *but this principle is only valid as long as the common good is secure and no injustice is entailed.* The duty of rulers is to protect the community and its various elements; in protecting the rights of individuals they must have special regard for the infirm and needy. For the richer class have many ways of shielding themselves and stand less in need of help from the State, whereas the mass of the poor have no resources of their own to fall back upon and *must chiefly depend upon the assistance of the State.*" And the import of these words applies with striking force to today's existing emergency.

There is no clash of liberty and social justice, but merely a clash of interpretations. And this clash may quickly be summarized in the recent words of two of our leading statesmen, ex-President Hoover and President Franklin Roosevelt. Says the former Chief Executive in his new book, "The Challenge to Liberty": "For the first time in two generations the American people are faced with the primary issue of humanity and all government—the issue of human liberty . . . We have to determine now whether, under the pressure of the hour, we must cripple or abandon the heri-

tage of liberty for some new philosophy which must mark the passage of freedom." And possibly in answer, said the present Chief Executive in his radio talk of fourteen days ago: "I am not for a return to that definition of liberty under which for many years a free people were being regimented into the service of the privileged few. I prefer and I am sure you prefer that broader definition of liberty under which we are moving forward to greater freedom, to greater security for the average man than he has ever known before in the history of America."

In conclusion, it may be said therefore, in my humble opinion, that the Church the great guardian of human liberties, sees nothing in the recent enactments over which to be alarmed. In fact, despite the possibility of future abuses—a possibility that will always confront us—she can safely place her stamp of approval in the interest of social justice upon the broad and humane philosophy that underlies the national legislation of the changing social order of America today.

Nationalism, True and False

LAURENCE K. PATTERSON, S.J.

*An address delivered before the Jesuit Philosophical Association
meeting at Manresa Island, Conn., August, 1934.*

IT is an almost obvious truism that exaggerated and bellicose nationalism is an outstanding world problem today. The present Holy Father, Pius XI, has written more than once concerning this burning issue. I cite but one passage from many: "Right order and Christian charity do not disapprove of lawful love of country, and of a sentiment of justifiable nationalism. If, however, egotism abusing this love of country and exaggerating this sentiment of nationalism, insinuates itself into the relations between people and people, there is no excess which will not seem justified, and that which between individuals would be judged blameworthy by all is now considered lawful and praiseworthy, if it is done in the name of this exaggerated nationalism. Instead of the

great law of love and human brotherhood, which embraces and holds in a single family all nations and peoples, with one Father who is in heaven, there enters hatred, driving all to destruction."

Two eminent Catholic historians have recently exposed the root dogmas of hyper-nationalism. Hilaire Belloc, in "Survivals and New Arrivals" devotes one chapter to the "Problem of Nationalism." He calls nationalism "The first element . . . in our modern main opposition" to the Church (p 106). "Nationalism . . . is an exaggerated and extreme mood from which all the white world suffers. It has all the marks of a religion in an esthetic sense." "In this it is that conflicts exist, potentially and always, between nationalism and the Catholic Church. For there is no room for two religions in any man's mind." "Patriotism has always existed, and should be strong." But patriotism should be sharply distinguished from nationalism. The essence of extreme nationalism lies in this: "The nation is made an end in itself." Thus the "nation-State" or the "totalitarian State claims the supreme and final loyalty of its citizens. It is, in the last analysis, their lord and master in body and soul. The State is thus practically deified, and becomes the "march of the Absolute upon earth," of which Hegel dreamed.

Carlton Hayes, in his "Essays on Nationalism" covers the same ground as Belloc, but in much greater detail. Dr. Hayes thus enunciates the two root dogmas of extreme nationalism. First, "That each nationality should constitute a unified independent, sovereign State; second, that every such national State should expect and require of its citizens not only unquestioning obedience and loyalty, not only exclusive patriotism, but also unshakable faith in its surpassing excellence over all other nationalities, and lofty pride in its peculiarities and in its destinies. This is nationalism and it is a modern phenomenon" (p. 6). Indeed, such nationalism is a very recent problem in world history.

The political unit in the Greek world was the "City-State," and before the advent of Alexander, Greek national consciousness was almost latent. The Roman Empire was essentially supra-national, the "Pax Romana," and the loyalty to the "Imperium" stand poles apart from the prevailing modern emotions and concepts. In the Middle Ages

the modern "Nation-State" either did not exist, or was but in a stage of embryonic development. The Medieval loyalties were either local, or were directed to great international Institutions. The Papacy and the Empire were supremely international in essence, and transcended nationality. The great Medieval problems, such as the struggle between "Imperium" and "Sacerdotium" were essentially international combats. True, patriotism has always existed, and nationality is no new phenomenon in history. But to quote Dr. Hayes once more: "The fusion of patriotism and nationality, and the predominance of national patriotism over all other human loyalties is very modern."

Modern nationalism is the result of many complicated causes. But the shattering of Christendom by the Reformation led to the final crystallization of the "Nation-State." To take but one or two examples: In 1400, Englishmen and Swedes retained a consciousness that they were part of "Christendom"; in 1600 their final loyalty was to a national King, regarded as "sovereignty personified." Even in Catholic lands, such as Spain and France, the "flare-back" of the Reformation was profound. Men no longer thought in "terms of the whole." Richelieu put the interests of France above those of Catholic Christendom. Curbing Calvinism at home, he salvaged the Reformation in Germany. Doubtless he convinced himself that the triumph of France would ultimately benefit the Holy Catholic Church, but in fact a Cardinal of the Roman Church was the chief agent in frustrating a final and decisive triumph of the Catholic Cause in the Thirty Years War. Richelieu paved the way for the Peace of Westphalia, which crystallized the religious division of Europe, and sounded the death knell of Christendom. It is needless to point out that behind Anglicanism lay nationalism, that the great driving force behind Lutheranism was again nationalism. "Luther sanctified particularism," *i. e.*, he blessed the diversion of religion into a narrow, nationalistic, Erastian groove, and by shattering the authority of Pope and Emperor, struck at the very foundations of Medieval and Catholic Christendom. Even Calvinism, in Holland and Scotland, soon became a nationalistic religion. Gallicanism in Catholic countries was but a modified form of Erastianism, essentially nationalistic in origin. But to trace the development, even in brief outline, of modern

nationalism lies beyond the scope of this paper. I pass to our own day and to our pressing contemporary problems.

The Great War, as we all know, was mainly the result of clashing nationalistic ambitions, often exploited and aggravated by selfish material interests lurking in the background. It was hoped that the lesson of the great butchery would be grasped. It was believed that a steadily growing realization of the need of international coöperation would result from the mighty holocaust of 1914-1918. Many pinned their faith on the League of Nations as a permanent organization of international society. All the friends of the League recognized its glaring defects. Born amidst the passions of the post-bellum era, linked to the Versailles Treaty, in some respects iniquitous, often swayed by dominating and selfish nationalistic groups, the League was at best but a struggling embryo. Again, it was suspected of being but a device through which France and her satellites legalized and sublimated their hegemony over Europe. Yet many believed and hoped that the League would, with the passage of time, become an increasingly effective instrument of peace and justice.

Men saw in it an idea "fundamentally Catholic," to quote Father Keating, of the *Month*, or a return to the Medieval concept of Christendom, when political problems were thought out "in terms of the whole." Yet today the League of Nations is in a state of virtual collapse. Some may rejoice at this, but I regard the failure of the League with apprehension, almost panic. The historian is miscast as a prophet; but viewing as he does the pageant of the past, he may be qualified to surmise the future.

Between 1871 and 1914 was the classic period of the "International Anarchy" so vividly portrayed by Lowes Dickinson, Bernard Fay, Spender, and a score of other scholars. Competitive armament, grasping imperialism, the "armed camp system," secret treaties, hostile alliances jockeying for position, such is the story of those fateful decades. Europe became a "forest of bayonets." All nations, from gigantic Russia to tiny Belgium claimed and exercised unlimited "sovereignty." The "Balance of Power" system, that Moloch to which countless men have offered life and limb, whose legacy to the world has been the blood of fathers, sons, and husbands, the tears of widows, orphans, daughters,

and sisters, which left to Europe economic exhaustion and a heritage of hate; this system held sway almost unchallenged, from 1871 to 1914. Then came the crash.

Yet in 1934, we seem fast drifting back to the ante-bellum era. Last month war seemed imminent, but the menace has been for the time averted. Russia and Japan confront one another in Manchuria and Mongolia. The Polish Corridor, the Saar, Austria, Dalmatia, these are but a few of the incipient Sarajevos which may explode, sooner or later, and precipitate another cataclysm more ghastly than that of 1914.

The Catholic Church is not "pacifist" in the usual sense of that term. Her Popes and theologians do not regard war as intrinsically and always evil. The Church blesses and sanctifies patriotism. War may be at times a stern necessity, yet we should note that modern warfare is incredibly destructive and brutalizing. "War is a saturnalia of sin" is the verdict of the courageous German Dominican, Father Strattmann. The "next war" of which some glibly talk, will be indescribably destructive. Stanley Baldwin tells us that the distinction between combatants and non-combatants will cease to exist. Germs will be utilized, and poison gas of incredible power will pour down upon women and children. Another holocaust may well spell the ruin of our civilization. Yet, unless the rising tide of nationalism be checked, unless the tacit alliance between the armament makers and politicians be exposed and broken, unless, to cite Benedict XV, "the rule of law be substituted for the rule of force" in international affairs, unless, in a word, the "international anarchy" be ended, another world cataclysm seems inevitable.

The international outlook is indeed dark. Stalin has made Bolshevism as nationalistic and imperialistic, beneath a pacifistic "smoke-screen," as the old Czarist régime. Germany is today beneath the dictatorship of Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and their ilk, who preach a gospel of nationalism so perverted and ludicrous that it would arouse contempt were it not so dangerous. In France, nationalism rides high, yet it is well to recall that French nationalism is largely, I think mainly, responsible for Hitlerism. Poincare, Tardieu, and their followers "cracked down" on beaten Germany.

Up to 1930, in my opinion, the bulk of the German nation sincerely desired a truly liberal and pacific Republic, yet Bruening was frustrated in his efforts to consolidate the Republic mainly through the brutal and bellicose policy of French nationalism. The German masses, ruined by war and inflation, beholding their nation treated as a pariah and a criminal, disarmed, but seeing the pledge of Clemenceau that the disarmament of Germany was to be but "an initial step" in a general limitation of armaments, flouted, turned in desperation to the gospel of National Socialism. French Catholics, as a rule, supported French rationalism. Blum, the Socialist, and Briand, the skeptic, were left to champion the cause of a real reconciliation with Germany. Blum could point to the massed Deputies of the "Right" and exclaim: "You profess to be Catholics; but I, the Jew, the Socialist, champion the Pope's policies in regard to Germany." In a word, the bulk of French Catholics made little effort to subordinate their nationalistic convictions and emotions. They lauded the Pope's utterances "in abstracto," but applied them to other nations "in concreto." In all European countries a recrudescence of violent nationalism has been noted in recent years. Disclaiming the rôle of a prophet, I feel that such a revival spells war.

I pass to our own country. Here I realize I am treading *ignes suppositos cineri doloso*. It is easy to denounce British imperialism in New York; it is not dangerous to refute the fallacies of Hitlerism in the Bronx; one is applauded at Keyser Island when a shot is fired at French Chauvinism. As a nation, we are scarcely chauvinistic. Yet are we entirely free from the venom of exaggerated nationalism? Most Americans regarded the Boer War as imperialistic and aggressive; but was our own exploit of 1898 praiseworthy? Read the illuminating work of Walter Miller, "The Martial Spirit," for a thorough exposé of the real motive behind that war. The nationalistic mind is myopic to the candid historian, the mutual recriminations of nationalists afford mingled amusement and disgust. The solution of the problem lies not in a drab cosmopolitanism, not in a sloppy and hysterical pacifism, but in the ruthless application of Papal, Catholic Christian principles to concrete realities.

The enunciation of abstract doctrines concerning the justifiability of war, resounding proclamations of unswerv-

ing loyalty to the flag, periodic patriotic outbursts, all doubtless have their place in Catholic propaganda and a solemn obligation to promote the cause of peace. We are not hysterical pacifists, but we are disciples of the "Prince of Peace." Hence, like Lincoln, "I do not assert anything, I but ask questions." Are Catholicism educators, as a class, keenly alive to their duty to promote "the Psychology of Peace"? Do we realize that the virtue of patriotism, like other virtues, may through exaggeration and perversion, degenerate into a vice? In our teaching of philosophy and history do we, perhaps, at times, glorify war? Do we ever suggest that even Uncle Sam is not always a glorified Archangel in his foreign relations? Carlton Hayes has analyzed a large number of French historical textbooks and finds that a majority of them teach bellicose nationalism in greater or less degree. Are our own texts free from this vice? It is clear that a majority of Americans are sincerely anxious to avoid war. Yet merely denouncing the horrors of war and lauding the beauties of peace, is apt to prove banal.

Hence, I venture a few concrete suggestions in this regard. Should another European War arise, let us "keep out of it" by the following means: First, sell no munitions whatever to combatants. This proposition will arouse the opposition of the munitions makers, their allies, and the "pseudo-patriotic" press and societies; but selling munitions is a first step to becoming involved in war. Let us renounce a quota of blood money for our merchants of death. Second, lend no money to combatants. This point is too obvious to need amplification. Third, resist propaganda. We all know how we were deluged with false and distorted propaganda before 1917. Fourth, "Take the profit out of War." Mr. Bernard Baruch is scarcely a radical, yet he has proposed a scheme which will practically nationalize industry at the declaration of war. If the young men must be drafted, why not draft capital? If the youth of the land must sacrifice or endanger life and limb, why should not the banker and the industrialist renounce their profits?

One word in conclusion concerning the Far East. Here I speak *salvo meliore iudicio*; but I do speak *ex imo corde*. Holding no brief for Japan's aggressive policies, it still seems that the Japanese need outlets for their teeming and growing population. The American nationalistic press, and

our professional patrioteers, have, I submit, assumed a strongly inconsistent attitude in regard to Foreign Affairs. "Shun the League of Nations; shun the World Court; avoid all European entanglements," such is their gospel. A narrow isolationist policy is the keystone of their creed. But in the East all is changed. They speak of the "Yellow Peril," and warn us of the "Japanese Menace." To plunge into China, to defend the "open door," to support Soviet Russia against Japan, such is the Eastern policy of a large section of American nationalists. On all this my comment is this: I do not think that the "Open Door" is worth a ghastly war; I do not think the Chinese market worth the price of American blood. I am no sloppy pacifist; and desire a navy adequate to defend our shores. I read in the *New York American*: "Uncle Sam must have a navy able to enforce his policies the world over." Here is the creed of nationalism. So the French Chauvinist speaks; so shouts the Hitlerite. This nation, under proper leadership, is capable of attaining "autarchy," *i. e.*, economic self-sufficiency and abundance. Why venture into China, and embroil ourselves in a situation whose result may well be war? As to a war against Japan as an ally of Soviet Russia, how can such a prospect fail to revolt our souls? Should Russia defeat Japan, the best authorities predict a wave of Bolshevism throughout Asia. I have no desire to use my slight influence to make the "East safe for Communism."

This paper may have seemed pessimistic. But to face hard and gruesome facts is sometimes needful. The "imponderables" are on the side of peace. Mr. G. P. Gooch, of Trinity College, Cambridge, well enunciates this point in *Current History* (August, 1934). Today, nationalism rides high, the munition-makers and their allies are in the ascendant; but even among Brown Shirts and Black Shirts there is a dislike for war. In our own land the rising generation tends to scoff at militarism. The war of 1914-1918 has been thoroughly "debunked." Pacifistic sentiment at times takes an extreme and perverted shape; sometimes pacifism is but a smoke-screen for Communistic propaganda. But let not American Catholics be stampeded into a nationalistic panic by the excesses of hysterical pacifism. The problems of peace; the question of nationalism; the structure of an International Society to supplant Interna-

tional Anarchy, are all ethical in their final analysis. Catholics alone possess the true Faith; we alone have that sound philosophy which can solve in time the burning issues so scantily touched upon in this paper.

Let us not despair. Gooch places his trust in "the indomitable spirit of man." We have better grounds for hope than the learned Cambridge Don. We are members of that "Great International," the Holy Catholic Church. "We should work for peace, even though the task be hard," are the words of the modern Athanasius, Cardinal Faulhaber. Extreme nationalism is a gospel of hate; and no Catholic priest or educator should foster it. John Bright once pointed to the "Crimea" monument and said. "They should put the last letter first: 'A Crime.'" That dauntless Quaker could claim with reason that "I am guiltless of squandering one penny of my country's treasure, or shedding one drop of my country's blood." I too would like the same said of what small influence I possess. Where do we stand? With the nationalists, the militarists, the selfish interests which thrive on war? Or with those elements which strive to check nationalistic pride and greed, to promote international charity and the psychology of peace? The world needs another, a better, a holier *Pax Romana*. Our own nation is best qualified to lead in laying the foundation for such a peace.

This paper is not meant to be dogmatic. Its aim has been simple: to show that the problems of nationalism, of war and of peace, involve deep thought on concrete realities, that there is a danger that abstract principles may prove futile, unless applied to contemporary problems definitely and fearlessly. We Catholic educators have a solemn duty to arouse a psychology of peace; to send forth from our colleges and universities young men and women imbued with the ideal of Catholic internationalism, who will turn a deaf ear to nationalistic propaganda, and who will use their influence, above all, in times of crisis, to avert the scourge of war. Woodrow Wilson doubtless made colossal blunders; even his motives are still debated; but I venture to quote his stirring retort to a heckler who shouted: "America First" in the midst of a speech delivered by him. "America first, yes; but America first in charity, first in cooperation, first in her devotion to our common humanity."